

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr, U.S. Patent No. 3,586,406, in view of Schaeffler et al., U.S. Patent No. 2,772,128.

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1, as amended, includes a feature of “the stub-shaped webs being dimensioned and located such that the stub-shaped webs have no contact with the rolling-contact elements during rotation of the cage.” The Examiner admits that, “Barr does not disclose stub-shaped webs on the side rings in the center of the pockets between the rolling-contact elements”, (Office Action, page 4). However, the Examiner contends that projections 27 and 28 in Schaeffler et al. are the equivalent of the claimed stub-shaped webs, (Office Action, page 4).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Although Schaeffler et al. states that, “[t]he projections 27 and 28 are so disposed as to project above and below the pitch circle into the free space between the needles,” (column 4, lines 15-17), there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion that these projections are dimensioned and located such that the projections have no contact with the needles during rotation of the cage 1 in Schaeffler et al., analogously to independent claim 1 herein.

Since each of dependent claims 3, 4 and 6 is directly dependent upon independent claim 1, each of claims 3, 4 and 6 is allowable over Barr in view of Schaeffler et al. for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 1 over Barr in view of Schaeffler et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement, a copy of a Search Report, and a listing of related art, along with enclosed references, is included with this Amendment for the Examiner’s consideration. Although no concise statement of relevance or other acceptable substitute

information is included for DE 10 09 445 B and DE 19 03 801 U, such additional information is being requested, and will be supplied when it becomes available.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 18, 2006:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Max Moskowitz  
Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
\_\_\_\_\_  
July 18, 2006  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Max Moskowitz  
Registration No.: 30,576  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF/MM/MIM:lac